UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ, No. 2:23-cv-03452-JAK (MRWx) Plaintiff, ORDER RE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS ON DEFENDANTS MICHAEL C. THOMPSON, GREGORY R. HOLMES AND v. MICHAEL C. THOMPSON, et al., YOUTUBE FOR MISPRISION, WITNESS AND PLAINTIFF Defendants. **INTIMIDATION (DKT. 60)** 

Based on a review of the Motion for Sanctions on Defendants Michael C. Thompson, Gregory R. Holmes and YouTube for Misprision, Witness and Plaintiff Intimidation (the "Motion" (Dkt. 60)), insufficient good cause has been shown for the requested relief. Therefore, the Motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff seeks to have sanctions imposed on Defendants for allegedly continuing the behavior described in Plaintiff's Fourth Amended Complaint. Continuing in an allegedly unlawful course of conduct during the pendency of a lawsuit challenging that conduct is not sanctionable misconduct. Also, Plaintiff has not cited any legal authority that would authorize the imposition of sanctions. Nor has Plaintiff presented any evidence of Defendants' alleged misconduct in a form that would be admissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence. Plaintiff also has not identified what was harassing or intimidating about the new messages he received. Further, Plaintiff's contention that Defendants were responsible for these messages is not based on evidence. Finally, under Local Rule 7-3, Plaintiff is required to meet and confer with opposing counsel in good faith before filing motions. The materials filed in support of the Motion do not state that Plaintiff sought to confer with counsel for Defendants prior to its filing. If Plaintiff files additional motions without meeting and conferring with opposing counsel or without citing appropriate legal authority, it may result in the issuance of an Order to Show Cause why sanctions should not be imposed.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>August 4, 2023</u>

am n

John A. Kronstadt

United States District Judge